

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the drawings because Examiner alleged that FIG. 3 and FIG. 5 are not legible.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hartman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,380,852).

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman in view of Dungan (U.S. Patent No. 6,794,991).

The Examiner graciously allowed claims 3-5.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Berg (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2004/0196142 A1).

The Examiner objected to claims 7-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harman in view of Feuerstein *et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,457).

Applicants have cancelled claims 1, 2, 7, and 10-13 and amended claim 6 in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations. Additionally, Applicants have amended claim 3 and added new claims, claim 14 and 15.

37 CFR 1.121(d)

The Examiner objected to the drawings because FIG. 3 and FIG. 5 are allegedly not legible. In response, Applicants amended the drawings with a Replacement sheet for FIG. 3 and FIG. 5 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). Applicant now contends that the drawings are legible and in condition for allowance.

New Claims

The new claims are fully supported by the specification and the figures. No new matter has been introduced with the new claims. Specifically, Applicant would like to cite support from the specification for new claims 14 and 15.

Support for claim 14 is found, for example, on page 4, line 4-6, page 5, line 8-11, and on page 8, line 22 through page 9, line 14. Additionally, support for claim 15, for example, can be found on page 8, line 26, 29 and on page 9, line 3. Therefore, Applicants contend that no new matter has been introduced with the addition of new claims 14 and 15 and respectfully submits that claims 14 and 15 are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Hartman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,380,852). In response, Applicants have cancelled claim 1.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Berg (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2004/0196142 A1).

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 6 is not anticipated by Berg, because Berg does not teach every feature found in claim 6. For example, as Examiner previously stated, Berg does not teach “said outlet tap includes: a signal generator means for showing the result in power source cut-off operation of said electrical appliance conducted at said outlet; and, a transmitter means for radio transmitting a radio signal representing said result in power source cut-off operation to said power source cut-off device, said radio signal representing said result in power source cut-off operation being prepared in said signal generator means, wherein said power source cut-off device further includes a receiver means for receiving said radio signal issued from said transmitter means of said outlet tap.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

Since claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 6, Applicants contend that claims 8 and 9 are also in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman in view of Dungan (U.S. Patent No. 6,794,991).

Applicants have cancelled claim 2.


The Examiner rejected claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harman in view of Feuerstein *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,457).

Applicants have cancelled claims 10-13.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 9-15-2006



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Arlen L. Olsen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a horizontal line underneath it.

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive, Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850